

1960

Approved For Release

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - HOUSE

149R000700190011-6

fall colors pass by, or perhaps even just to loaf. Hiking along the riverbank or to some remote cave, sink, or site where man of yore terday lived; wandering through little known Powder Mill Cave or into spectacular Jam Up Caver, climbing down a shaded trail to magnificent Greer Spring—all of these and many other opportunities would be available to the visitor. A carefully developed interpretive program would add to his enjoyment and understanding of the area.

One of the questions that arises in establishing such a recreational area, especially one which is to include long, narrow strips of property bordering rivers, is that of the best manner of maintaining this property in the state of natural beauty which we seek.

In the bill which I have introduced I have included for consideration a plan of acquisition which would help answer this question. I propose that the Federal Government purchase the land which it will need for campsites, picnic areas, administrative buildings, and the other public services necessary in connection with a national park; and at the same time purchase a scenic easement along each bank of the river, leaving ownership of these lands in the hands of the present owners but restricting the use of the banks to a certain distance from the river to pursuits not inconsistent with the overall purpose of the park.

This easement along the river would operate in a manner similar to the setback ordinances of many cities which require so many feet of yard between the street and the front of the building on a particular lot. Also similar to the setback ordinances, this easement would operate as only a partial restriction on the full use and enjoyment of the property owner. In this case most of the riparian owners are farmers; their profitable utilization of the riverbank property, especially in light of bank stabilization, could easily be integrated with the use of the river for outdoor recreation.

In view of the needs of our people for areas of outdoor relaxation and enjoyment, and in view of the widespread support for developing the Current and Eleven Point Rivers area for these purposes, I urge favorable action on this bill by the Congress.

#### IS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OVERCENTRALIZING, OVERCONGESTING, AND OVERBUILDING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I urged the House Committee on Government Operations, of which I am a member, to make a comprehensive study of executive branch policies and practices relating to Federal decentralization, relocation, and dispersal. My request is set forth in the following letter to the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON:

AUGUST 3, 1960.

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to urge that the Committee on Government Operations, through an appropriate existing subcommittee or perhaps a special subcommittee, un-

dertake as promptly as possible a study on the important policy question of the decentralization of facilities and operations of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

It seems to me that the question of Federal decentralization, relocation and dispersal falls clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations, because it is directly related to the efficient and economical functioning of our Government.

The executive branch now employs approximately 2,170,000 civilians inside the United States. Even if the Federal Government assumes no additional responsibilities in the future, it is reasonable to assume that the number of Federal employees will continue to increase roughly in proportion to the increase in our total population. There is surely no reason to assume that the responsibilities of the Federal Government will diminish in the foreseeable future. And even if the number of Federal employees does not increase, it is obvious that the Government must continue, and accelerate, the present program of erecting new buildings to modernize its physical plant, to replace inefficient space with usable facilities, and to house its employees and its operations in permanent, well-designed working quarters rather than in unsightly temporary buildings and in expensive, inadequate rented space.

The question of where Federal employees and Federal buildings will be located in the future is one that, in my judgment, cries out for immediate study and long-range planning. The executive branch and each of its departments and agencies should be requested to set forth current and future plans for expansion, construction, and employee location, and their policy, if any, with respect to decentralization, dispersal, or relocation.

The Congress, it seems to me, has a larger duty than merely approving or disapproving the construction of individual Federal buildings or facilities in particular locations.

Because of the size and complexity of the executive branch, the Congress needs to be assured that the various departments and agencies are, to the maximum extent possible, coordinating their activities in these areas, and needs to be assured that there is a clearly understood and accepted policy on Government decentralization—for or against—based on sound thinking and proper planning.

I submit that the Committee on Government Operations is the most appropriate agency of the Congress to require the presentation by the executive branch of its plans and programs, to insist on the development of a coordinated and clear policy on decentralization, and to assist in the formulation of such a policy.

The fact is that there now is no policy.

Because of my own concern about this matter, I requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in January of 1960 to prepare a memorandum for me concerning decentralization policy and practice in the executive branch. A copy of the Legislative Reference Service memorandum is enclosed.

In summary, main findings of the Legislative Reference Service study are as follows:

1. "The Eisenhower administration has not declared, adopted or acted upon any form of overall policy for or against administrative decentralization."
2. "No universally understood or accepted program of administrative decentralization is being followed or is in existence."
3. "Most of the departments and agencies do not have established or announced programs or plans of their own for administrative decentralization."
4. While some decentralization has taken place within some departments and agencies

since 1953, this decentralization has been in response to specific situations rather than as a part of a long-range policy."

In answer, the Library of Congress points out that there has been no long-range planning and coordination in the executive branch concerning decentralization, and precious little thought given to the subject within individual departments and agencies.

Yet it is evident that the future location of Federal employees and Federal facilities is of vital importance to the District of Columbia and the surrounding area, to other cities and metropolitan areas in the United States which might be selected as the sites of decentralized Federal operations; and, most importantly, to the efficient and economical functioning of the Federal Government in a manner best calculated to serve the public interest.

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the first Hoover Commission, in its report of May 30, 1949, pointed out that while economy in administration can often be achieved through centralization, it is also possible to overcentralize, with the result of increasing costs and decreasing efficiency. The Commission (p. 27) stated that its task forces had found "overcentralized operations which are resulting in inefficient and expensive management." The report went on:

"Our task forces also found many instances where headquarters officials in Washington still cling to the power to make decisions even in matters of minor importance. This, too, has resulted in interminable delays in getting things done, has stultified initiative in the field services, and has resulted in decisions being made which have not taken due account of variations in local conditions."

The Commission concluded that further decentralization was needed. But, with a few exceptions such as in the Post Office Department, little has been done.

Obviously, there are certain "headquarters" functions of the Government which must be performed at the seat of Government. Obviously, too, there are certain functions which are clearly field services, and can only be effectively performed in the field away from Washington, D.C.

There are, however, many operations of Government which do not fall clearly into the "headquarters" category or the "field" category. It is with these operations that we must be increasingly concerned. We must determine whether they can best be performed in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere.

In these days of modern, rapid communication and transportation it seems to me that there are fewer and fewer functions which really need to be performed in Washington, D.C. A number of questions occur:

How many additional Federal employees are to be brought into the District of Columbia and surrounding area? How many new Federal buildings are to be built in or near the District? How can the District, Maryland, and Virginia make logical plans for the orderly development of the National Capital area unless the Federal Government's intentions are known on a reasonably long-range basis?

What has been and will be the effect on the metropolitan area and its people of the location of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Central Intelligence Agency outside but within a few miles of the District? Is this decentralization? Is this relocation or dispersal in the civil defense sense? Does it make sense?

If the Government continues to expand and build in the District and nearby area, what will be the cost, in terms not only of land and buildings, but in terms of congestion, vulnerability, highways, mass transportation, parking, housing, and other requirements of modern living and working?